

United States District Court

Southern District of Texas

Corpus Christi Division

United States Courts  
Southern District of Texas  
FILED

ms. Bobbie David Hauckamp  
Plaintiff

JUN 17 2020

David J. Bradley, Clerk of Court

vs

Civil Action 2:17-CV-18'

CMFC of UTM&B

Defendants

Objection to

D.E. 158 under Deception

To the Honorable Judge of said court,

NOW COMES,

ms. Bobbie AKA the Plaintiff and objects to the Defendants late and misplaced motion to dismiss the present Civil action.

In situations such as this, its a created confusion by the Defendants to pull the argument to a area that has nothing to do with the Civil action that asks for nothing more than to produce the standard of care for the treatment of Gender Dysphoria that is acceptable in the medical community for the treatment of a Transsexual woman

District court filed civil action 2:17-cv-18, we are at the 5th Circuit  
procedural errors to dismiss, I object. We are past procedural in the

The new members are bound to the CWHC as a group. The  
group elected the Texas Attorney General to represent them, the  
group that these lawyer signed off on the FRCP 12 motions, the  
District Court declined to adopt the motion to dismiss — stated  
the Plaintiff stated a claim for relief.

Honorable, am I missing something? No matter what claims  
the new members bring forward, the claims cannot defeat the fact  
the Plaintiff stated a claim for relief, the Defendants  
are running game on the Plaintiff. End of story.

#### Summary

The Plaintiff advances that the DE, 158 is a sham due to  
the fact the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure does not allow a motion  
to dismiss to proceed after the District Court denies the  
Defendant's motion to dismiss.

The decision by the District court that the Plaintiff stated

(7)

a claim for relief bars re-litigation and is a decision on the merits.

Let the Plaintiff be very clear, the Plaintiff did not sue the CMHC Board. Dr. Linthicum is the original complainant, Document 62 was sued with Dr. Pownl.

The Texas Attorney General put the CMHC of 2017 on the suit because they could provide relief.

Now, when we deal with Boards, all government in the United States are styled as Corporation Board from the President of the United States to the lowest being county government.

At the county level you normally have a County Judge presiding over the County Commissioners.

The County Judge is considered the permanent chair, elected every 6 years, the County Commissioners are board members) elected every two years.

In the present case, the CMHC has a permanent chair its Defendant Dr. Linthicam. Board members will come and go but the permanent chair remains.

Dr. Linthicam is the majority whip of the CMHC, she's the Boss.

All new members are joined with  
the original party. The names of the  
have been dismissed and their offices to dismiss  
the present office. The names of former  
and the Texas Attorney General, and their  
a dozen for relief

The Left has more bodies of the  
original party - Linthicum, Tunison, Hudson,

House of C.H. to the original party.  
transferred to be president of the after an  
dictate the person to whom the transfer was  
resigned party, unless the count upon me then  
action may be continued by the authorites + the  
role as quite clear, the  
ERC D 25 (a) (c) Transfer of Justice + the

decided on its merits and nothing will be done.  
absent, D.V.I. Action Z:17-CU-18 was already  
when the next board members were

73 E 3d 66, 62 (S+H C: 1996)  
unions the standards of Tax Law - City of Atlanta  
Appeal as of date depending on ERCF 12(b)(6) whether  
and whether they could, the defendant's may not  
Again let the Plaintiff be my client, the  
Plaintiff stated a claim for relief, once a claim

Dr. Linthicum chairman had a serious  
and action going on.

The court needs to remember, the Plaintiff  
voiced concern did he say, tried members  
really understand what kind of people  
do this — Are they insane?? All of the  
was brought up.

You Honor, I've ask  
the Clerk for DE 158, I have never seen  
a Motion to Dismiss. I would of picked  
it up, under what F.R.C.P Rule are they  
allowed to do this?

The Plaintiff advanced the New  
members are a Sham, they are just on  
the Board to allow a talking point on  
a New Motion to dismiss (not Action 2.17-18).

Am I wrong? produce their paper.  
Their schooling, their medical degrees, who  
appointed them? What rule, what procedure,

The court realize that in 6 months we have civil action 2:17-cv-18 in the Court for 5 years on just procedures!! This is what gives law a bad name.

The Plaintiff has been in these kind of situations, her mind is clear, steady and she has the determination to sweat it out.

Your Honor, they are going to answer this Civil action.

- Need the court to clearly define the issue Garcia is raising
- Need the court to note, the CMHC were in the sort do to the Texas Attorney General and the court as the ones that could give me relief
- Dr. Linthicum was the one the Plaintiff sued, she's the whip of the CMHC
- Give the Plaintiff permission to by-pass the District Judge and go right to the 5<sup>th</sup> circuit to settle Garcia issue to do a <sup>2<sup>nd</sup></sup> dismissal.
- The stay stops everything, so all the due dates are out the window. The court should take notice, interested parties are waking up, be prepared for strange people to show up.

This is not the Plaintiff doing. It's one thing to walk fearlessly and impartially with the public at large, but 5 years on procedures, Really!! what do you call this? its also called not wanting to take on responsibility, and walk fearlessly and impartially with the public at large and devote Equal Protection to the Plaintiff for being a Transsexual woman, fearlessly know the courts/bew have your back

\* The Plaintiff reminds the Court, her Motion for Production of Documents was struck by the Court and she had to file direct with the Defendants.

\* In the 5th Circuit Joint Motion to Stay pg 6 of 10.

The Defendants said As Hause-Kamp's situation has not changed since her first stay, there is no basis to find a stay will irreparable harm her now.

\* Your Honor, I am being harmed, I do not get any relief on the Non-Invasive treatment in Gibson/Colleges

\* You got 3 entitled parties with serious self damage over no treatment or relief.

\* You got a old Freeze Frame policy that going on where you get a Boa/Hormone, yet are denied the Significant Relief in Gibson space. And it continues, And it won't stop.

\* The Plaintiff filed a temporary restraining order it was ignored.

\* Your Honor, I signed on June 8, 2020  
a order from the Texas Attorney General they  
would be in response to the Motion for  
protective order.

I filed a response on the same day, June 8, 2020

\* On June 9, 2020 I got issued a court order  
document 171 granting the Defendants motion  
for a protective order.

\* The odd thing here is the Court order  
is signed June 3, 2020

\* Your Honor, this makes the Plaintiff  
look like a fool and says volumes) that the  
Defendants get what they want, regardless  
of what the Plaintiff files or when it's filed  
or what the Plaintiff says.

\* I never saw D.E. 158, it's just a  
show to allow the Defendants time to get  
a Stay before the 5th Circuit that's all  
this is about.

\* There's nothing more the Plaintiff  
can say, the June 3, 2020 Court order says  
it all — it don't matter what the  
Plaintiff says

With respect

Ms. Bobbie

June 14, 2020

## Certification of Service

The Plaintiff swears on penalty of perjury that she drop this in the prison mail box on \_\_\_\_\_ to be delivered to the Clerk of the Courts to file and mail to the following Attorneys:

1. Texas Attorney General - Corbello  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

and

2. Right Behind Bars  
Samuel Weiss - Attorney at Law  
416 Florida Ave., NW 20015-2  
Washington, D.C.  
20001

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

June 03, 2020

David J. Bradley, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

DAVID ALLEN HAVERKAMP; aka  
HAVERKAMP,

卷之三

Plaintiff,  
VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:17-CV-18

JOSEPH PENN, *et al.*

233

## Defendants.

8

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
& DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

The Court has reviewed Defendants' Joint Motion for Protective Order (

The Court finds that good cause exists to grant a temporary stay of discovery.

It is hereby ORDERED that Defendants' motion (D.E. 169) is GRANTED. This

Court hereby **ORDERS** that all discovery served in this case shall be stayed, and no further discovery shall be served, until Defendants' motion to dismiss (D.E. 158) is resolved.  
*never get this -*

The Court has further considered Plaintiff's Motion for Production of Documents

(D.E. 170). The motion is DENIED at this time because the Court has granted this

temporary stay of discovery.

ORDERED this 3rd day of June, 2020.

What temporary  
30 days? or  
3 years?

Julie K. Hampton  
United States Magistrate Judge

1 / 1